



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,047	07/22/2003	Claude F. Meares	061818-5015US01	1090
43850 7590 10/14/2009 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP (SF) One Market, Spear Street Tower, Suite 2800 San Francisco, CA 94105				
EXAMINER				
FETTEROLF, BRANDON J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1642				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/14/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/625,047

Applicant(s)

MEARES ET AL.

Examiner

BRANDON J. FETTEROLF

Art Unit

1642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 8, 10-24, 26, 27, 33-36, 38 and 40-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 8, 10-15, 24, 26-27, 33-36, 38, 40-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claims 6, 8, 10-15, 16-24, 26-27, 33-36, 38, 40-43 are currently pending.

Claims 16-23 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

Claims 6, 8, 10-15, 24, 26-27, 33-36, 38, 40-43 are currently under consideration.

All previous Rejections have been withdrawn in view of Applicants amendments.

New Rejection upon careful review and reconsideration:

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims , 8, 10-15, 24, 26-27, 33-36, 38, 40-43 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 7,528,235 in view of Hansen et al. (WO 99/66951, of record).

US Patent No. 7,528,235 claims an isolated antibody comprising a light chain and heavy chain which appears to be identical to the claimed antibody in the present application (claim 1). In particular, the patent claims that the antibody binds to substituted DOTA (claim 1). Moreover, the

patent claims that the antibody further comprises a targeting moiety which specifically binds a cell surface protein (claims 5-6).

The Patent does not explicitly claim a method of treating cancer by administration of said antibody, followed by administration of a macrocyclic chelate such as DOTA.

Hansen et al. teach a method of treating diseased tissues in a patient, comprising: (a) administering to a patient a bi-specific antibody or antibody fragment having at least one arm that specifically binds to a targeted tissue and at least one arm that specifically binds a targetable conjugate; (b) optionally, administering to said patient a clearing composition, and allowing said composition to clear non-localized antibodies or antibody fragments from circulation; and (c) administering to said patient a first targetable conjugate which comprises a carrier portion which comprises or bears at least one epitope recognizable by said at least one other arm of said bi-specific antibody or antibody fragment, and one or more therapeutic agents (page 58, claim 1 of WO document). With regards to the targetable conjugate's epitope, the WO document teaches (page 9, lines 30-33) that the epitope includes, but is not limited to, a hapten. With regards to the hapten, Hansen et al. teach (page 10, line 2 and page 34, lines 27-28) that haptens include, but are not limited to, chelators such as DPTA and DOTA. For example, the WO document teaches (page 35, lines 7-11) a method of treating CEA-expressing tumors, wherein a bi-specific antibody with at least one arm, which specifically binds to CEA, and at least one arm, which specifically binds the targetable conjugate whose hapten is a conjugate of yttrium-DOTA is administered to a patient. With regards to the bi-specific antibody which recognizes CEA and a metal chelate such as DOTA, the WO document teaches (page 10, lines 26-33) that the bi-specific antibody is generated by derivatizing an anti-CEA F(ab')₂ mAb with a hydrazide-maleimide cross-linker and coupling said derivatized anti-CEA F(ab')₂ to an anti-chelate Fab'-SH. Moreover, Hansen et al. teach (page 24, lines 24-33) that chelators, such as DOTA, may be conjugated to the carrier portion of a targetable conjugate by generating a reactive functional group such as carbodiimide and coupling the carbodiimide to the peptides free amines.

Thus, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the references so as to use the antibody as claimed in US Patent No. 7,528,235 in the method taught by Hansen et al. One would have been motivated

to do so because Hansen teaches that antibodies which bind macrocyclic chelates such as DOTA are useful for pretargeting treatments. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would have a reasonable expectation of success that by use the antibody as claimed in US Patent No. 7,528,235 in the method taught by Hansen et al., one would achieve a method of treating cancer.

Therefore, No claim is allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDON J. FETTEROLF whose telephone number is (571)272-2919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brandon J Fetterolf
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1642

/Brandon J Fetterolf/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1642